

To Whom It May Concern: I use XM radio exclusively throughout the day for all of my news and information needs. For this privilege, I have paid approximately \$250 for equipment, and \$10/month for programming. XM radio programming is not only reliable, but provides diversity no longer found on broadcast radio, which has become nothing more than a melange of Top 40 music stations and one-note talk radio stations, with very, very little in between. It is for that reason I have embraced XM for its ability, at my choice and at my additional expense, to provide a much, much, much broader array of news and entertainment options. Given that I have paid for extra equipment, and pay for monthly programming, I fail to see the benefit in stifling XM radio by disallowing its ability to provide traffic and weather. Further, its coverage of various MSA's around the country allows me to make travel plans, by being aware of weather and traffic conditions in those cities, something NOT available on broadcast radio. As a citizen and radio listener, so long as I am paying for a service, I should be able to get whatever service I want. Broadcast radio stations do NOT have a monopoly on news and information. I can get weather from my web-enable cell phone; should that be stopped as well? I can get news and sports and entertainment as well from my web-enable cell phone, and that competes with broadcast radio, and uses the public radio spectrum. I pay for that privilege via my cellular carrier as well. Should they be prohibited from offering information that is similar to what broadcast radio offers? I don't think so. And by the way, those broadcast radio providers didn't pay for the radio spectrum they are using, unlike most other providers. So they came by their franchise for free, they should be willing to deal with other providers that offer similar services.

Respectfully,

Lawrence D. Hadley